Attorney Docket: 46107-0087

Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2005

## **Amendments To The Drawings**:

The attached substitute drawing sheet for FIG. 3A has been redrafted to enlarge the figure to better show the stake grooves and to add reference numeral 46, but has not been changed in any substantive manner.

Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2005

## REMARKS

In an Office Action dated April 4, 2005, the Examiner (1) rejected the Information Disclosure Statement filed on October 30, 2003 as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(2), stating that no copy of a drawing dated November 28, 2001 was received, (2) objected to the drawings as filing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because the drawings fail to show the stake grooves recited in Claim 4, in view that reference numeral 46 is used in the description to identify the grooves but in the drawings no groove structure is indicated by numeral 46, (3) objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(k) because the scale of the drawings is too small to show the details described at paragraph [0037] and recited in Claim 4, (4) objected to the specification as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.71 and § 1.75(d)(1) because the detailed description fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter in Claim 5, (5) rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failure to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention, because Claim 4 recites a limitation "said inboard wall defining a plurality of stake grooves" [disposed below the annular groove], stating that the drawings show no structure nor is clear why the stake grooves would be disclosed below the annular groove, (6) rejects Claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,881,324 to Girquis, and (7) rejected Claims 1-3 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. US-2003-0224862-A1 to Schultz. By this response, Applicants amend Claim 1, cancel Claim 4, resubmit a copy of the drawing dated November 28, 2001 as cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed October 30, 2003, and provide a replacement sheet of drawings for the drawing sheet showing FIG. 3A.

Attorney Docket: 46107-0087

Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2005

In regards to the Examiner's statement that no copy of the drawing dated November 28,

2001 was received, Applicants have enclosed a copy of the postcard from the U.S. Patent and

Trademark Office acknowledging receipt of the drawing dated November 28, 2001 (Appendix

A). However, to speed up prosecution of the application, Applicants are providing an additional

copy of the drawing dated November 28, 2001 as Appendix B to this Response.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings for failing to show stake grooves,

and the scale of the drawings being too small to show the details described in paragraph [0037]

and recited in Claim 4, Applicants have submitted a replacement sheet for FIG. 3A. Applicants

respectfully submit that the stake grooves are clearly shown in sufficient scale and now are

labeled 46 in FIG. 3A. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the drawings previously

filed with the application clearly identify the stakes grooves in FIGS. 1, 3B, 5 and 6 with

numeral 46 and clearly show the stake grooves in sufficient scale in FIGS. 1, 3A, 3B, 5 and 6.

In regards to the Examiner's objection to the specification as failing to comply with 37

C.F.R. §§ 1.71 and 1.75(d)(1), Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that

paragraphs [0032] and [0037] provide sufficient support for the limitations in Claim 5.

Paragraph [0032] states that various size retention members and/or various sized spacers may be

selected to secure the replacement spider in an approximately balanced position before coupling

the retention member to the annular groove. Because the replacement spider assembly includes

the bearing cups as shown in FIG. 8 and defined in the specification, it is inherent that the spider

assembly being located in an approximately balanced position would also mean that the bearing

cup is located in an approximately balanced position within said aperture.

With regards to the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph,

regarding Claim 4, Applicants have cancelled this claim. However, because material from Claim

Page 9 of 11

Attorney Docket: 46107-0087

Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2005

4 has been added to independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner

regarding the drawing showing no such structure. Applicants respectfully submit that the

drawings shown in FIGS. 1, 3A, and 3B clearly show the subject matter of Claim 4. The inboard

wall in FIGS. 1, 3A, and 3B clearly defines a plurality of stake grooves. Furthermore, the

specification clearly supports why the stake grooves are disposed below the annular groove, as

claimed by the limitation "said inboard wall defining a plurality of stake grooves". Paragraph

[0028], states that stakes 44 engage a spider assembly 50, specifically, the bearing assembly 70

and are formed within the aperture 40. As is described in paragraphs [0031] and [0032], the

stakes 44 are cut with a cutting tool and the original spider assembly is replaced with a

replacement spider assembly. The retention members are coupled in the annular grooves of the

aperture and a spacer is placed between the retention members and the new bearing assemblies to

maintain the replacement spider assembly in an approximately balanced position. Therefore, it is

clear from both the drawings and the detailed description that the stake grooves are located on

the inboard wall, and as stated by the Examiner, they would be disposed below the annular

groove.

In regards to the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as

being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,881,324 to Girquis, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Amended Claim 1 now includes the limitation that the aperture includes an inboard radial wall

that defines a plurality of stake grooves while the outboard radial wall defines the annular

groove. Applicants respectfully submit that Girquis does not define any stake grooves and

therefore does not disclose each and every limitation of amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants

respectfully submit that Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are in a condition for allowance.

Page 10 of 11

Attorney Docket: 46107-0087

Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2005

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated

by Schultz. Applicants respectfully submit that Schultz does not show stake grooves on the

inboard radial wall and therefore does not disclose each and every limitation of the present

invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-3, 5-7 are in a condition for allowance. If

the Examiner believes that personal communication would expedite the prosecution of this

application, please telephone the undersigned at (248) 433-7231.

Prompt and favorable consideration and allowance of this application is respectfully

requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC

Attorneys for Applicants

Date: 6-30-05

Craig A. Phillips Reg. No. 47,858

Dickinson Wright PLLC 1901 L Street, NW

Suite 800

Washington, D.C. 20036

(248) 433-7231

CAP/gmp

Enclosures

BLOOMFIELD 46107-87 701301v1

## PE JOHN & TRADE

## APPENDIX A

Please Date St	am	PER	ىل	wn*	
Applicant(s): Joseph Schlegelmann et al.   Case No.: 46				107-01-7 (V203-0067)	
Title: Universal Joint And Method	d Of Se			ed Universal Joint	
Please acknowledge receipt of:  Express Mail Label No. ER 307 737 924 I in the amount of \$878.00 (\$770.00 - utili additional claims fee); Utility Patent App sheet); Fee Transmittal For Fy 2004 (1 she page patent application including at lea abstract; eight (8) sheets of drawings s Unexecuted Declaration and Power of Information Disclosure Statement (4 pg. pages); and copies of non-US cited refer U.S. pending Patent Application No. 10 and drawing (1 page).	ty filing lication eet - in ast one howing of Atto s); PTO rence (c	g fee; \$108.00 Transmittal duplicate); 1 claim and g Figures 1-1 rney (4-pg -1449 Form copy of relat	0 - (1 19- an (3; s); (3 ed	17858 U.S. PTO 10/696791 103003 USPTO Date Stamp	
Duo	Attor	nov: D	Δ <b>λ</b> //	/CAP/Sepanik	O4s

